



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/585,516

07/10/2006

Shoufu Hou

608-483

5878

23117 7590 11/15/2010
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

SHUMATE, ANTHONY R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1775

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/15/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

ATTACHMENT TO ADVISORY ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant argues at pages 6-7, "Referring to claim 18, the term "post-" in "post-processing" refers, for example, to the processing being after the plating step, not necessarily after any drying step. In the description of Example 1 (page 9 lines 2 to 4 of the specification), for example, a drying step is a part of the "post-processing" and is carried out before the partial removal or reduction in volume of the pore fillers."

a. Respectively, the Examiner does not find this argument persuasive. This argument merely supports that the claim is indefinite for the reasons defined in the previous action.

3. The previous 35 USC 112 rejection, particularly for the phrase, "preferably" is withdrawn in light of Applicant's arguments at page 7 third paragraph.

2. Applicant argues at pages 7-12 that it would not be obvious to substitute the metal 3 of KAWAE with the calcium carbonate material of BLAHA.

b. Respectively, the Examiner does not find this argument persuasive. The Applicant is not arguing the rejection made.

3. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

Art Unit: 1775

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

4. In response to any remaining arguments not already addressed, absent any further teaching as to why or how the previous rejection(s) are improper the Examiner does not find the argument(s) persuasive and maintains the rejection(s).